

**REMARKS**

The objection to the disclosure has been addressed as has been the objection to Claim 2.

The rejection of Claims 1-3, 14, 15 and 18 under 35 USC §112, ¶2 is traversed, and reconsideration is respectfully requested in light of the foregoing amendments to Claims 1 and 2.

The rejection of Claim 1 as regards lines 13-14 is not understood. That claim recites only one output shaft, and Claim 1 has been amended to make clear that the referenced torque is associated with that output shaft.

The rejections of Claims 1-3, 14 and 15 as being anticipated by WO '559 and of Claims 2 and 18 also as being anticipated by WO '559, both under 35 USC §102(b) are traversed. Reconsideration of each of these rejections is respectfully requested.

The Office Action asserts that the WO '559 document and its U.S. equivalent teach the control unit of Claims 1 and 2, more particularly, how the first or second motors are controlled so as to suppress a thrust or push-up on the torque of the claimed output shaft or a drawn or pull-in on the output shaft. However, the referenced section in the corresponding U.S. patent, (namely, column 3, line 47 to column 4, line 34) merely teaches that the gear wheel pair 2E, 2A be synchronized with the output shaft 25, i.e., making the rpm difference between the gear wheel pair and the output shaft as small as possible via the

electric machine 35 being operated as an electric motor with the clutch 30 disengaged. This is no teaching whatsoever, about the driving of a motor so as to suppress a thrust or push-up on the output shaft torque resulting from inertia torque. In other words, the motors are being used to suppress torque change. No where is that taught in the WO '559 document. The reference to this prevention of interruption to tractive force at col. 4, line 1 cannot be understood to mean the suppression of torque change but only the force associated with the driving torque itself. The WO '559 document does not even suggest the claimed invention hereon.

Accordingly, early and favorable action is earnestly solicited.

If there are any questions regarding this amendment or the application in general, a telephone call to the undersigned would be appreciated since this should expedite the prosecution of the application for all concerned.

If necessary to effect a timely response, this paper should be considered as a petition for an Extension of Time sufficient to effect a timely response, and please charge any deficiency in fees or credit any overpayments to Deposit

Serial No. 10/084,385  
Amendment Dated: March 1, 2006  
Reply to Office Action Mailed: December 1, 2005  
Attorney Docket No. 056207.50859US

Account No. 05-1323 (Docket #056207.50859).

March 1, 2006

Respectfully submitted,



---

James F. McKeown  
Registration No. 25,406

CROWELL & MORING LLP  
Intellectual Property Group  
P.O. Box 14300  
Washington, DC 20044-4300  
Telephone No.: (202) 624-2500  
Facsimile No.: (202) 628-8844  
JFM:dg